Dear Hal, 11/17/98

Lil, is doing well where the hospital has sent her, to where they specialize in physical therapy for senior citizens, but she is not close to coming home. Which I am about the leave for Johns Hopkins for evaluation of what can be done for my kidney failure. If I am lucky they'll be able to get the access inside my left forearm. If I'm that lucky I'll be going to a diuretic place of the hospital three times a week with the treatment time taking four hours. Then there is coming and going and I'll not be allowed to drive the first three weeks. So, much is on my mind and I've too much to catch up with.

Gary begins his 9/27 article referring to Twyman's position on the argument and to yours. If he had the required knowledge of the subject-matter he'd never refer to anything Twyman wrote. Twyman is a subject-matter ignoramus off on an ego trip he has the means to indulge. He is remarkable ignorant of the basic, official information for all the time, money and effort he has put into this. He has kept himself away from what is official, proven and basic as he pursues what makes him believe he is Perry Mason returned. Which is largely what can be said about Gary and others. They get an idea and nothing else is important to them. In pursuit of their idea thet stick to that alone and in the course of it the basic official evidence is lost on them. Even when they have it, they have not read it or they have ingored it.

Long ago I wrote Gary, as I did you, to look at the earliest of the Zap. frames the FBI suppressed when it was making copies for printing. Two of those frames show, clearly, that the back of the head is not only intact but not a hair is out of place, not a trace of blood can be seen.

I also pointed out that if the film was doctored it was done irrationally because it destroys the official story. The X-rays show that non-military ammo was used in the head wound and nobody would go to the trouble of faking and do the opposite of what the faking is for. As you may remember, both panels the reports of which I have in the PH appendix, with appropriate footnotes, state what disproves the Report when they examined that film.

Gary has, to the best of my knowledge, not shown any interest in finding any other explanation of what he is so excited about.

He cites McClelland but he does not recall, on McC's dependability as an observer, in those times of extraordinary stress, that he wrote a memo saying that Kennedy was struck in his left forehead. And as an example of the little slips that find thei way into what is written, he says, 10/98, that the ARRB was a" apanel of civil historians." One was not.

Where he refers to what HSCA omitted he ignores that one reason could have

not to have to face the perjury issue, the autopsists having testified to it other than the dod the WC.

I'll look at the other enclosures, for which many thanks, when I have the time.

Thanks and best,

Vah